

APR 26 2006

Aaron Miller
Project Coordinator
881 Main Street
Herculaneum, MO 63048

Site:	Herculaneum
ID#	MD006266373
Break:	2.0
Other:	0400
	A717 4/26/06

RE: Comments on the Herculaneum Soil and Dust Lead Bioavailability Memorandum for the Herculaneum Lead Smelter Site

Dear Mr. Miller:

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) have completed their review of the subject document for the Herculaneum Lead Smelter Site (Site) and are providing the following comments. Our comments are limited to evaluating whether Doe Run's proposed approach is consistent with the EPA lead risk assessment guidance, as we did not review the underlying studies referenced in this memorandum.

Comments

1. **Page 1, par. 1** It is technically inaccurate to state that *in vitro* models measure bioavailability. Rather, *in vitro* tests measure the rate or extent of solubilized lead in an extraction solvent that resembles gastric fluid. This solubilized fraction should be referred to as *in vitro* bioaccessibility (IVBA), which may be an indicator of *in vivo* relative bioavailability (RBA). Doe Run should use the term "*in vitro* bioaccessibility" in the risk assessment text and figures to ensure this concept is accurately characterized.
2. **In Vitro Study Results (p. 2)** This section examines various relationships between IVBA and other parameters such as lead concentration and distance from the smelter. While these evaluations have merit, the conclusions are qualitative in nature (e.g., "strong relationship") and are not supported by any statistical tests. Doe Run should provide documentation of the statistical analyses of these relationships in an Appendix to the risk assessment, unless these relationships will not be discussed in the document.
3. **Slag storage pile (p. 5)** EPA's current policy is that *in vivo* bioassays (e.g., juvenile swine) are the only approach for quantitatively measuring and adjusting default bioavailability in site-specific lead risk assessments (EPA, 1999). Because an *in vitro* bioaccessibility test has not yet been validated with *in vivo* data for lead, the risk

SUPR:FFSE:MORRISON:DLR:7596:4/25/06:G:\FFSE\HER.DR.LET48.BIOAVAILABILITYMEMO
FFSE
MORRISON

BAM

40259216



SUPERFUND RECORDS

assessment must use the default absolute bioavailability of 12% when evaluating an adolescent trespasser on the slag pile. The IVBA results can be used to characterize the uncertainty with using the default value.

4. **Slag storage pile (p. 5)** Region 7 also notes that the juvenile swine model was developed for predicting RBA in human children. As a result, the risk assessment should acknowledge there is additional uncertainty when using *in vivo* bioavailability estimates for adolescents and adults because evidence exists to indicate that absolute bioavailability of soluble lead (e.g., in food or water) varies with age.
5. **Additional *in vitro* results (p. 5)** Region 7 agrees that the 77% bioaccessibility estimate is significantly higher than the other three reported values. However, the risk assessment should also acknowledge that this result may not be an “outlier,” but represents the full range of roadway dust bioavailability in Herculaneum.
6. ***In Vivo* Study Results (p. 6)** Region 7 does not agree entirely with the statement that it is “unlikely if not impossible” for lead in Herculaneum soils to be more bioavailable than soluble lead. While it is unlikely, it is not impossible for lead in soil to be more bioavailable than lead acetate. Also, Region 7 points out that the occurrence of a measured RBA value above 1.0 cannot be attributed solely to animal variability, but would likely be a result of several sources of measurement error such as analytical and statistical uncertainty. It is also possible that measured RBA values may be too low (e.g., liver) as a result of measurement error. The overall impact is reduced by using the mean of four endpoint-specific RBA values. Any discussion of this issue in the risk assessment should be presented in a balanced fashion.
7. **Comparison of *In Vitro* and *In Vivo* Estimates (p. 6)** In comparing the IVBA and *in vivo* RBA estimates for soil and dust, Doe Run is making an assumption that the *in vitro* method yields results identical to *in vivo* values (i.e., one-to-one relationship). However, EPA’s analysis of 19 test materials shows the best fit linear correlation between *in vivo* RBA and IVBA values yields the following equation:

$$RBA = 1.03(IVBA) - 0.06$$

This analysis is part of EPA’s efforts to validate a specific *in vitro* test method for lead which is currently undergoing external peer review. Because the equation is based on samples collected primarily from mining and milling sites, it is plausible that some forms of lead might not follow the observed correlation. Our initial evaluation indicates the samples evaluated for IVBA at the Herculaneum Lead Smelter Site would fall within the range of soil types and lead phases evaluated as part of the correlation analysis. Thus, Region 7 recommends using this mathematical equation to estimate *in vivo* RBA. The resulting values should be used when comparing results from the two test methods and also when characterizing the potential variability in bioavailability across the site.

8. **Comparison of *In Vitro* and *In Vivo* Estimates (p. 6)** This section identifies three possible options for selecting an RBA estimate based on *in vivo* and *in vitro* results. But as discussed in Comment #3, only site-specific *in vivo* studies can be used to replace the default bioavailability values in lead risk assessments. The *in vivo* RBA estimates for soil (97%) and dust (52%) must be used in the risk assessment because they currently represent the best measure of oral uptake in young children at the Herculaneum Lead Smelter Site. The IVBA results should be addressed when discussing the uncertainties of the risk assessment, particularly in the case of dust where the results bracket the *in vivo* result of 52%.
9. **Comparison of *In Vitro* and *In Vivo* Estimates (p. 7)** Region 7 does not agree that it is appropriate to round all RBA estimates to one significant figure because of uncertainty. While we agree there is uncertainty as well as variability in the actual RBA values, EPA does not address this inherent uncertainty and variability by rounding all values to one significant figure. Rather, the range of bioavailability estimates should be fully characterized in the risk assessment and the uncertainties associated with each step of the risk assessment process discussed.

References

U.S. EPA. 1999. Short Sheet: IEUBK Model Bioavailability Variable. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Washington, D.C. EPA/540-F-00-0

In conclusion and as agreed to during our meeting on November 21, 2005, the draft Baseline Human Health Risk Assessment should now be prepared for the Site. Please call me at 913-551-7755 or Mr. Michael Beringer at 913-551-7351, if you have any questions concerning these comments.

Sincerely,

Bruce A. Morrison
Project Manager
Superfund Division

C: Robert Hinkson, MDNR
Teresa Bowers, Gradient
Cherri Baysinger, DHSS

Bcc: Dana Skelley, CNSL